

"A roof at the same pitch as the original house will help the extension to blend with the character of the house. It will be more attractive to look at, require less maintenance and reduce opportunity for intruders to break-in to upper floor windows. Generally the roof should be pitched at the same angle as the original building". We reflect the original roof line of the adjacent structure.

The definition of 'original building' is defined in the Cheltenham Borough Local Plan Second Review, Adopted July 2006 (page 58) and states it as being prior to July 1948.

The Officers report makes no mention of the submitted RAF aerial photograph that definitively illustrates that the house as it presently stands existed prior to July 1948. The house as it stands should be considered original for the purposes of all planning decisions.

- I have included an extract from The Local Plan.....(4.18) "Extensions to existing buildings need to be carefully designed to respect the character and scale of the existing building or group of buildings. In accordance with policy CP 7, they should be to a high standard of design, and would normally be expected to use materials which match the original building, with similar forms of roofs, doors, windows and other elements. In cases where it is important that the extension remains subordinate to the original building, it may be appropriate to distinguish the extension by a substantial set back in the building line. Occasionally, a different approach may be appropriate to separate and differentiate an extension from the main building. The most important consideration is that an extension should not detract from the original.....".

It is clear that this proposal meets with every aspect of Policy CP7 & does **not** harm the integrity of the building, or group of buildings or the character & appearance of the Conservation Area.

- We reiterate that this application has been reduced by 48% footprint area in direct response to the previous (refused) scheme & that this reduction addresses all of the concerns raised in the Appeal Inspectors report.
- The primary consideration in this application (as supported by the Appeal Inspector) is the affect that the proposals have on the character & appearance of the Conservation Area. We would submit that this rear extension has negligible effect on the Conservation Area and should be considered accordingly.

We would conclude that the (Policy) reasons for refusal are flawed & that this application should be determined by Committee members subjectively in the context of the effect that this rear extension has on the building & the Conservation Area.

I would be grateful if you could confirm receipt of this correspondence & also that Committee members have been issued with the contents.

We look forward to the decision.

Please do not hesitate to contact me with any queries.

Yours sincerely



Kaye Roberts

cc Mr & Mrs P Johnston